

BOUNDS FOR BETTI NUMBERS

TIM RÖMER

ABSTRACT. In this paper we prove parts of a conjecture of Herzog giving lower bounds on the rank of the free modules appearing in the linear strand of a graded k -th syzygy module over the polynomial ring. If in addition the module is $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded we show that the conjecture holds in full generality. Furthermore, we give lower and upper bounds for the graded Betti numbers of graded ideals with a linear resolution and a fixed number of generators.

INTRODUCTION

Let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be the polynomial ring over a field K equipped with the standard grading by setting $\deg(x_i) = 1$, and let M be a finitely generated graded S -module. We denote by $\beta_{i,i+j}(M) = \dim_K \operatorname{Tor}_i(M, K)_{i+j}$ the graded Betti numbers of M .

Assume that the initial degree of M is d , i.e. we have $M_i = 0$ for $i < d$ and $M_d \neq 0$. We are interested in the numbers $\beta_i^{lin}(M) = \beta_{i,i+d}(M)$ for $i \geq 0$. These numbers determine the rank of the free modules appearing in the linear strand of the minimal graded free resolution of M . Let $p = \max\{i: \beta_i^{lin}(M) \neq 0\}$ be the length of the linear strand. In [13] Herzog conjectured the following:

Conjecture. *Let M be a k -th syzygy module whose linear strand has length p , then*

$$\beta_i^{lin}(M) \geq \binom{p+k}{i+k}$$

for $i = 0, \dots, p$.

This conjecture is motivated by a result of Green [12] (see also Eisenbud and Koh [8]) that contains the case $i = 0, k = 1$. For $k = 0$ these lower bounds were shown by Herzog [13], and Reiner, Welker [16] proved them for $k = 1$ if M is a monomial ideal.

In this paper we prove the conjecture for $k = 1$. For $k > 1$ we get the weaker result:

If $\beta_p^{lin}(M) \neq 0$ for $p > 0$ and M is a k -th syzygy module, then $\beta_{p-1}^{lin}(M) \geq p + k$.

We also show that the conjecture holds in full generality for finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded S -modules. The first three sections of this paper are concerned with the question above.

In the last years many authors (see for example [4, 14, 15]) were interested in the following problem: Fix a possible Hilbert function H for a graded ideal. Let $\mathcal{B}(H)$ be the set of Betti sequences $\{\beta_{i,j}(I)\}$ where $I \subset S$ is a graded ideal with Hilbert function H . On $\mathcal{B}(H)$ we consider a partial order: We set $\{\beta_{i,j}(I)\} \geq \{\beta_{i,j}(J)\}$ if

$\beta_{i,j}(I) \geq \beta_{i,j}(J)$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. It is known that $\mathcal{B}(H)$ has a unique maximal element given by the Betti sequence of the lex-segment ideal in the family of considered ideals. In general there is more than one minimal element (see [6]).

In Section 4 we study a related problem. We fix an integer $d \geq 0$ and $0 \leq k \leq \binom{n+d-1}{d}$. Let $\mathcal{B}(d, k)$ be the set of Betti sequences $\{\beta_{i,j}(I)\}$ where $I \subset S$ is a graded ideal with d -linear resolution and $\beta_{0,d}(I) = k$. We show that, independent of the characteristic of the base field, there is a unique minimal and a unique maximal element in $\mathcal{B}(d, k)$.

The author is grateful to Prof. Herzog for inspiring discussions on the subject of the paper.

1. PRELIMINARIES ON KOSZUL COMPLEXES

Let K be a field, V be an n -dimensional K -vector space with basis $\mathbf{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$ and $S = K[V]$ be the symmetric algebra over V equipped with the standard grading by setting $\deg(x_i) = 1$. Furthermore let $\mathfrak{m} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be the graded maximal ideal of S and $0 \neq M$ be a finitely generated graded S -module which is generated in not negative degrees, i.e. $M_i = 0$ for $i < 0$.

Consider a graded free S -module L of rank j which is generated in degree 1 and let $\bigwedge L$ be the exterior algebra over L . Then $\bigwedge L$ inherits the structure of a bigraded S -module. If $z \in \bigwedge^i L$ and z has S -degree k , then we give z the bidegree (i, k) . We call i the homological degree (hdeg for short) and k the internal degree (deg for short) of z .

We consider maps $\mu \in L^* = \text{Hom}_S(L, S)$. Note that L^* is again a graded free S -module generated in degree -1 . It is well-known (see [5]) that μ defines a graded S -homomorphism $\partial_\mu: \bigwedge L \rightarrow \bigwedge L$ of (homological) degree -1 .

Recall that if we fix a basis $e_1, \dots, e_j$ of L , then $\bigwedge^i L$ is the graded free S -module with basis consisting of all monomials $e_J = e_{j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{j_i}$ with $J = \{j_1 < \dots < j_i\} \subseteq [j] = \{1, \dots, j\}$. One has

$$\partial_\mu(e_{j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{j_i}) = \sum_{k=1}^i (-1)^{\alpha(k, J)} \mu(e_{j_k}) e_{j_1} \wedge \dots \hat{e}_{j_k} \dots \wedge e_{j_i}$$

where for $F, G \subseteq [n]$ we set $\alpha(F, G) = |\{(f, g): f > g, f \in F, g \in G\}|$ and where $\hat{e}_{j_k}$ indicates that e_{j_k} is to be omitted from the exterior product. Denote by $e_1^*, \dots, e_j^*$ the basis of L^* with $e_i^*(e_i) = 1$ and $e_i^*(e_k) = 0$ for $k \neq i$. In order to simplify notations we set $\partial_i = \partial_{e_i^*}$. Then $\partial_\mu = \sum_{k=1}^j \partial_\mu(e_k) \partial_k$, and we have the following:

Lemma 1.1. *Let $z, \tilde{z} \in \bigwedge L$ be bihomogeneous elements, $f \in S$ and $\mu, \nu \in L^*$. Then:*

- (i) $f \partial_\mu = \partial_{f\mu}$,
- (ii) $\partial_\mu + \partial_\nu = \partial_{\mu+\nu}$,
- (iii) $\partial_\mu \circ \partial_\mu = 0$,
- (iv) $\partial_\mu \circ \partial_\nu = -\partial_\nu \circ \partial_\mu$,
- (v) $\partial_\mu(z \wedge \tilde{z}) = \partial_\mu(z) \wedge \tilde{z} + (-1)^{\text{hdeg}(z)} z \wedge \partial_\mu(\tilde{z})$.

Proof. Straightforward calculations (most of them are done in [5]). □

We fix a graded free S -module L of rank n for the rest of the paper. Let $\mathbf{e} = e_1, \dots, e_n$ be a basis of L with $\deg(e_i) = 1$ for $i \in [n]$, and $\mu \in L^*$ with $\mu(e_i) = x_i$ for $i \in [n]$. For $j = 1, \dots, n$ let $L(j)$ be the graded free submodule of L generated by $e_1, \dots, e_j$. Then $(K(j), \partial)$ is the Koszul complex of $x_1, \dots, x_j$ with values in M where $K(j) = \bigwedge L(j) \otimes_S M$ and ∂ is the restriction of $\partial_\mu \otimes_S \text{id}_M$ to $\bigwedge L(j) \otimes_S M$.

We denote by $H(j)$ the homology of the complex $K(j)$, and the homology class of a cycle $z \in K(j)$ will be denoted by $[z]$.

Notice that $K_i(j)_{i+k} = 0$ for $k < 0$ and that $H_i(n) \cong \text{Tor}_i(K, M)$ are isomorphic as graded K -vector spaces. One has the following exact sequence (see [5]):

$$\dots \rightarrow H_{i+1}(j) \rightarrow H_i(j-1)(-1) \rightarrow H_i(j-1) \rightarrow H_i(j) \rightarrow \dots$$

The following observation is crucial for the rest of the paper. For a homogeneous element $z \in K_i(j)$ we can write z uniquely as $z = e_k \wedge \partial_k(z) + r_z$ and e_k divides none of the monomials of r_z .

Lemma 1.2. *Let $z \in K_i(j)$ be a homogeneous cycle of bidegree (i, l) . Then $\partial_k(z)$ is for all $k \in [n]$ a homogeneous cycle of bidegree $(i-1, l-1)$.*

Proof. This follows from 1.1. □

In the sequel we need the following:

Lemma 1.3. *Let $p \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $H_p(j)_{p+l} = 0$ for $l = -1, \dots, t-1$. Then:*

- (i) $H_p(j-1)_{p+l} = 0$ for $l = -1, \dots, t-1$,
- (ii) $H_p(j-1)_{p+t}$ is isomorphic to a submodule of $H_p(j)_{p+t}$,
- (iii) $H_i(j)_{i+l} = 0$ for $l = -1, \dots, t-1$ and $i = p, \dots, j$.

Proof. We prove (i) by induction on $l \in \{-1, \dots, t-1\}$. If $l = -1$ there is nothing to show because $H_p(j-1)_{p+l} = 0$ for $l < 0$. Now let $l > -1$ and consider the exact sequence

$$\dots \rightarrow H_p(j-1)_{p+l-1} \rightarrow H_p(j-1)_{p+l} \rightarrow H_p(j)_{p+l} \rightarrow \dots$$

Since by induction hypothesis $H_p(j-1)_{p+l-1} = 0$ and by the assumption $H_p(j)_{p+l} = 0$, we get that $H_p(j-1)_{p+l} = 0$.

For $l = t$ the exact sequence of the Koszul homology together with (i) yields

$$0 \rightarrow H_p(j-1)_{p+t} \rightarrow H_p(j)_{p+t} \rightarrow \dots,$$

which proves (ii).

We show (iii) by induction on $j \in [n]$. The case $j = 1$ is trivial and for $j > 1$ and $i = p$ the assertion is true by assumption. Now let $j > 1$, $i > p$ and consider

$$\dots \rightarrow H_i(j-1)_{i+l} \rightarrow H_i(j)_{i+l} \rightarrow H_{i-1}(j-1)_{i-1+l} \rightarrow \dots$$

By (i) and the induction on j we get that $H_i(j-1)_{i+l} = H_{i-1}(j-1)_{i-1+l} = 0$. Hence $H_i(j)_{i+l} = 0$. □

2. LOWER BOUNDS FOR BETTI NUMBERS OF GRADED S -MODULES

In this section M is always a finitely generated graded S -module which is generated in degrees ≥ 0 . For $0 \neq z \in K_i(j)$ we write

$$z = m_J e_J + \sum_{I \subseteq [n], I \neq J} m_I e_I$$

with coefficients in M , and where e_J is the lexicographic largest monomial of all e_L with $m_L \neq 0$. Recall that for $I, J \subseteq [n]$, $I = \{i_1 < \dots < i_t\}$, $J = \{j_1 < \dots < j_{t'}\}$ $e_I <_{lex} e_J$ if either $t < t'$ or $t = t'$ and there exists a number p with $i_l = j_l$ for $l < p$ and $i_p > j_p$. We call $\text{in}(z) = m_J e_J$ the initial term of z . Furthermore for $I = \{i_1 < \dots < i_t\} \subseteq [n]$ we write $\partial_I = \partial_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ \partial_{i_t}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $p \in \{0, \dots, j\}$, $r \in \{0, \dots, p\}$ and $0 \neq z \in K_p(j)$ be homogeneous with $\text{in}(z) = m_J e_J$. Then for all $I \subseteq J$ with $|I| = r$ the elements $\partial_I(z)$ are K -linearly independent in $K_{p-r}(j)$. In particular, if z is a cycle, then $\{\partial_I(z) : I \subseteq J, |I| = r\}$ is a set of K -linearly independent cycles.*

Proof. This follows from the fact that $\text{in}(\partial_I(z)) = m_J e_{J-I}$. Induction on $r \in \{0, \dots, p\}$ proves that all $\partial_I(z)$ are cycles if z is one. $\square$

Lemma 2.2. *Let $p \in [j]$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z \in K_p(j)_{p+t}$. Assume that $H_{p-1}(j)_{p-1+l} = 0$ for $l = -1, \dots, t-1$.*

- (i) *If $p < j$ and $\partial_j(z) = \partial(y)$ for some y , then there exists $\tilde{z}$ such that $\tilde{z} = z + \partial(r)$ and $\partial_j(\tilde{z}) = 0$. In particular, $\tilde{z} \in K_p(j-1)$, and if z is a cycle, then $[z] = [\tilde{z}]$.*
- (ii) *If $p = j$ and $\partial_j(z) = \partial(y)$ for some y , then $z = 0$. In particular, if $z \neq 0$ is a cycle, then we always have $0 \neq [\partial_j(z)] \in H_{p-1}(j)_{p-1+t}$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on $t \in \mathbb{N}$ to prove (i). If $t = 0$, then $y \in K_p(j)_{p+t-1} = 0$, and so $\partial_j(z) = 0$. Thus we choose $\tilde{z} = z$.

Let $t > 0$ and assume that $\partial_j(z) = \partial(y)$. We see that $\partial_j(y)$ is a cycle because

$$0 = \partial_j(\partial_j(z)) = \partial_j(\partial(y)) = -\partial(\partial_j(y)).$$

But $\partial_j(y) \in K_{p-1}(j)_{p-1+t-1}$. Since $H_{p-1}(j)_{p-1+t-1} = 0$, it follows that $\partial_j(y) = \partial(y')$ is a boundary for some element y' .

By the induction hypothesis we get $\tilde{y} = y + \partial(r')$ such that $\partial_j(\tilde{y}) = 0$. Note that

$$\partial(\tilde{y}) = \partial(y) = \partial_j(z).$$

We define

$$\tilde{z} = z + \partial(e_j \wedge \tilde{y}) = z + x_j \tilde{y} - e_j \wedge \partial_j(z).$$

Then

$$\partial_j(\tilde{z}) = \partial_j(z) + x_j \partial_j(\tilde{y}) - \partial_j(e_j) \wedge \partial_j(z) + e_j \wedge \partial_j \circ \partial_j(z) = \partial_j(z) - \partial_j(z) = 0$$

and this proves (i).

If $p = j$, we see that $z = m e_{[j]}$ for some $m \in M$ and therefore $\partial_j(z) \neq 0$ if and only if $z \neq 0$.

We prove (ii) by induction on $t \in \mathbb{N}$. For $t = 0$ there is nothing to show. Let $t > 0$ and assume $\partial_j(z) = \partial(y)$. By the same argument as in the proof of (i) we

get $\partial_j(y) = \partial(y')$ for some y' . The induction hypothesis implies $y = 0$, and then $z = 0$. $\square$

Lemma 2.3. *Let $p \in \{0, \dots, j\}$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \neq z \in K_p(j)_{p+t}$. Assume that $H_p(j)_{p+l} = 0$ for $l = -1, \dots, t-1$ and let $q \in [j]$. If $z \in K_p(j-q)_{p+t} \subseteq K_p(j)_{p+t}$ and $\partial(y) = z$ in $K(j)$ for some element y , then there exists $\tilde{y} = y + \partial(r) \in K_{p+1}(j-q)_{p+1+t-1}$ such that $\partial(\tilde{y}) = z$.*

Proof. We prove the assertion by induction on $j - q$. For $j = q$ there is nothing to show. Let $j > q$. Since $0 = \partial_j(z)$ and

$$z = \partial(y) = \partial(e_j \wedge \partial_j(y) + r) = x_j \partial_j(y) - e_j \wedge \partial(\partial_j(y)) + \partial(r),$$

we see that $\partial_j(y)$ is a cycle and therefore a boundary by the assumption that $H_p(j)_{p+t-1} = 0$. By 2.2 we may assume that $y \in K(j-1)$. By the induction hypothesis we find the desired $\tilde{y}$ in $K(j-q)$. $\square$

Lemma 2.4. *Let $t \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\beta_{n-1, n-1+t}(M) = 0$ for $l = -1, \dots, t-1$ and $\beta_{n, n+t}(M) \neq 0$, then there exists a basis $\mathbf{e}$ of L and a cycle $z \in K_n(n)_{n+t}$ such that*

- (i) $[z] \in H_n(n)_{n+t}$ is not zero,
- (ii) $[\partial_i(z)] \in H_{n-1}(n)_{n-1+t}$ are K -linearly independent for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

In particular, $\beta_{n-1, n-1+t}(M) \geq n$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{e}$ be an arbitrary basis of L . Since $\beta_{n, n+t}(M) \neq 0$ there exists a cycle $z \in K_n(n)_{n+t}$ with $0 \neq [z] \in H_n(n)_{n+t}$. Furthermore $H_{n-1}(n)_{n-1+l} = 0$ for $l = -1, \dots, t-1$. In this situation we have $z = me_{[n]}$ for some socle element m of M and we want to show that every equation

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i [\partial_i(z)] = [\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \partial_i(z)] \quad \text{with} \quad \mu_i \in K,$$

implies $\mu_i = 0$ for all $i \in [n]$. Assume there is such an equation where not all μ_i are zero. After a base change we may assume that $\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \partial_i = \partial_n$. We get

$$0 = [\partial_n(z)],$$

contradicting to 2.2 (ii). $\square$

Theorem 2.5. *Let $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \in [n]$. If $\beta_{p-1, p-1+t}(M) = 0$ for $l = -1, \dots, t-1$ and $\beta_{p, p+t}(M) \neq 0$, then there exists a basis $\mathbf{e}$ of L and a cycle $z \in K_p(n)_{p+t}$ such that*

- (i) $[z] \in H_p(n)_{p+t}$ is not zero,
- (ii) $[\partial_i(z)] \in H_{p-1}(n)_{p-1+t}$ are K -linearly independent for $i = 1, \dots, p$.

In particular, $\beta_{p-1, p-1+t}(M) \geq p$.

Proof. We have $H_p(n)_{p+t} \neq 0$ because $\beta_{p,p+t}(M) \neq 0$. Choose $0 \neq h \in H_p(n)_{p+t}$. We prove by induction on n that we can find a basis $\mathbf{e}$ of $L(n)$ and a cycle $z \in K_p(n)_{p+t}$ representing h such that every equation

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i [\partial_i(z)] = [\sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i \partial_i(z)] \quad \text{with} \quad \mu_i \in K,$$

implies $\mu_i = 0$ for all i . The cases $n = 1$ and $n > 1, p = n$ were shown in 2.4.

Let $n > 1$ and $p < n$. Assume that there is a basis $\mathbf{e}$ and such an equation for a cycle z with $[z] = h$ where not all μ_i are zero. After a base change of $L(n)$ we may assume that $\sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i \partial_i = \partial_n$. Then $0 = [\partial_n(z)]$, and therefore $\partial_n(z) = \partial(y)$ for some element y . By 2.2 we can find an element $\tilde{y}$ such that $[\tilde{y}] = [z]$ and $\tilde{y} \in K_p(n-1)_{p+t}$. Now 1.3 guarantees that we can apply our induction hypothesis to $\tilde{y}$ and we find a base change $\mathbf{l} = l_1, \dots, l_{n-1}$ of $e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}$, $[\tilde{z}] = [\tilde{y}]$ in $H_p(n-1)_{p+t}$ (with respect to the new basis) such that $[\partial_i(\tilde{z})] \in H_{p-1}(n-1)_{p-1+t}$ are K -linearly independent for $i = 1, \dots, p$. By 1.3 we have $H_i(n-1)_{i+t} \subseteq H_i(n)_{i+t}$ for $i = p-1, p$. Then $\tilde{z}$ is the desired cycle because $[\tilde{z}] = [z]$ in $H_p(n)_{p+t}$. $\square$

The Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity for a finitely generated graded S -module $0 \neq M$ is defined as $\text{reg}(M) = \max\{j \in \mathbb{Z} : \beta_{i,i+j}(M) \neq 0 \text{ for some } i \in \mathbb{N}\}$. For $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ we define $d_k(M) = \min(\{j \in \mathbb{Z} : \beta_{k,k+j}(M) \neq 0\} \cup \{\text{reg}(M)\})$. We are interested in the numbers $\beta_i^{k,\text{lin}}(M) = \beta_{i,i+d_k(M)}(M)$ for $i \geq k$. Note that $\beta_i^{0,\text{lin}}(M) = \beta_i^{\text{lin}}(M)$. If $0 \neq \Omega_k(M)$ is the k -th syzygy module in the minimal graded free resolution of M (see [7] for details), then we always have $\beta_{i,i+j}(M) = \beta_{i-k,i-k+j+k}(\Omega_k(M))$ for $i \geq k$. Therefore $\beta_i^{k,\text{lin}}(M) = \beta_{i-k}^{\text{lin}}(\Omega_k(M))$ for these i . Observe that $d_0(\Omega_k(M)) = d_k(M) + k$.

Corollary 2.6. *Let $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$. If $\beta_p^{k,\text{lin}}(M) \neq 0$ for some $p > k$, then*

$$\beta_{p-1}^{k,\text{lin}}(M) \geq p.$$

For the numbers $\beta_i^{\text{lin}}(M)$ and $\beta_i^{1,\text{lin}}(M)$ we get more precise results. The next result was first discovered in [13].

Theorem 2.7. *Let $p \in \{0, \dots, n\}$. If $\beta_p^{\text{lin}}(M) \neq 0$, then*

$$\beta_i^{\text{lin}}(M) \geq \binom{p}{i}$$

for $i = 0, \dots, p$.

Proof. This follows from 2.1 and the fact that there are no non-trivial boundaries in $K_i(n)_{i+d_0(M)}$. $\square$

To prove lower bounds for $\beta_i^{1,\text{lin}}$ we use slightly different methods. Let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. We fix a basis $\mathbf{e}$ of L such that $\partial(e_i) = x_i$ for all $i \in [n]$ for the rest of this paper. For $a \in \mathbb{N}^n$ we write $x^a = x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n}$ and call it a monomial in S . Let F be a graded free S -module with free homogeneous basis $g_1, \dots, g_t$. Then we call $x^a g_i$ a monomial in F for $a \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $i \in [t]$. Let $>$ be an arbitrary degree refining term order on F with $x_1 g_i > \dots > x_n g_i > g_i$ (see [7] for details). For a homogeneous

element $f \in F$ we set $\text{in}_>(f)$ for the maximal monomial in a presentation of f . Note that we also defined $\text{in}(z)$ for some bihomogeneous $z \in K(n)$.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $M \subset F$ be a finitely generated graded S -module and let $0 \neq z$ be a homogeneous cycle of $K_1(n, M)$ with $z = \sum_{j \geq i} m_j e_j$, $\text{in}(z) = m_i e_i$. Then there exists an integer $j > i$ with $0 \neq \text{in}_>(m_j) > \text{in}_>(m_i)$. In particular, m_i and m_j are K -linearly independent.*

Proof. We have

$$0 = \partial(z) = m_i x_i + \sum_{j > i} m_j x_j.$$

Hence there exists an integer $j > i$ and a monomial a_j of m_j with $\text{in}_>(m_i) x_i = a_j x_j$ because all monomials have to cancel. Assume that

$$\text{in}_>(m_i) \geq \text{in}_>(m_j).$$

Then

$$\text{in}_>(m_i) x_i > \text{in}_>(m_i) x_j \geq \text{in}_>(m_j) x_j \geq a_j x_j$$

is a contradiction. Therefore

$$\text{in}_>(m_i) < \text{in}_>(m_j).$$

□

Construction 2.9. *Let $M \subset F$ be a finitely generated graded S -module, $p \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ and let $0 \neq z$ be a homogeneous cycle of $K_p(n, M)$ with $z = \sum_{J, |J|=p} m_J e_J$, $\text{in}(z) = m_I e_I$. Assume that $I = \{1, \dots, p\}$. For $k = 0, \dots, p$ we construct inductively sets*

$$J_k = \{1, \dots, p-k, j_1, \dots, j_k\}$$

with $j_k > p-k+1$, $j_k \neq j_i$ for $i = 0, \dots, k-1$ and

$$\text{in}_>(m_{J_k}) > \text{in}_>(m_{J_{k-1}}) > \dots > \text{in}_>(m_{J_0}).$$

Set $J_0 = I$. Assume that J_{k-1} is constructed. Then we apply 2.8 to

$$\partial_{\{1, \dots, p-k, j_1, \dots, j_{k-1}\}}(z) \text{ where } \text{in}(\partial_{\{1, \dots, p-k, j_1, \dots, j_{k-1}\}}(z)) = m_{J_{k-1}} e_{p-k+1}$$

and find $j_k > p-k+1$ such that $\text{in}_>(m_{\{1, \dots, p-k, j_1, \dots, j_{k-1}\} \cup \{j_k\}}) > \text{in}_>(m_{J_{k-1}})$. We see that $j_k \neq j_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ because these e_{j_i} do not appear with non-zero coefficient in $\partial_{\{1, \dots, p-k, j_1, \dots, j_{k-1}\}}(z)$.

Corollary 2.10. *Let $M \subset F$ be a finitely generated graded S -module, $p \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ and let $0 \neq z$ be a homogeneous cycle of $K_p(n, M)$ with $z = \sum_{J, |J|=p} m_J e_J$. Then there exist $p+1$ coefficients m_J of z , which are K -linearly independent.*

Proof. This follows from 2.9 because the coefficients there have different leading terms. □

Theorem 2.11. *Let $p \geq 1$ and M be a finitely generated graded S -module with $\beta_p^{1,lin}(M) \neq 0$. Then*

$$\beta_i^{1,lin}(M) \geq \binom{p}{i}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, p$.

Proof. Let

$$0 \rightarrow M' \rightarrow F \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$$

be a presentation of M such that F is free and $M' = \Omega_1(M)$. We show that

$$\beta_i^{lin}(M') \geq \binom{p'+1}{i+1} \text{ for } p' = p - 1.$$

Since $\beta_i^{1,lin}(M) = \beta_{i-1}^{lin}(M')$, this will prove the theorem.

After a suitable shift of the grading of M we may assume that $d_0(M') = 0$. Note that M' is a submodule of a free module and we can apply our construction 2.9. Since $\beta_{p'}^{lin}(M') \neq 0$, we get a homogeneous cycle $0 \neq z$ in $K_{p'}(n, M')_{p'}$. There are no boundaries except for zero in $K_i(n, M')_i$ and therefore we only have to construct enough K -linearly independent cycles in $K_i(n, M')_i$ to prove the assertion. Assume that $\text{in}(z) = m_{[p']e_{[p]}}$ and construct the numbers $j_1, \dots, j_{p'}$ for z by 2.9.

Let $t \in \{0, \dots, p\}$ and set $i = p' - t$. Consider the (by 2.1) cycles $\partial_L(z)$ with $L \in W = W_0 \dot{\cup} \dots \dot{\cup} W_t$ where

$$W_k = \{I \cup \{j_1, \dots, j_k\} : I \subseteq [p' - k], |I| = t - k\} \text{ for } k \in \{0, \dots, t\}.$$

We have

$$|W_k| = \binom{p' - k}{t - k}$$

and therefore

$$|W| = \sum_{k=0}^t \binom{p' - k}{t - k} = \binom{p' + 1}{t} = \binom{p' + 1}{p' - t + 1} = \binom{p' + 1}{i + 1}.$$

If we show that the cycles $\partial_L(z)$ are K -linearly independent, the assertion follows.

Take $L \in W$, $L = I_L \cup \{j_1, \dots, j_{k_L}\}$ for some $I_L \subseteq [p' - k_L]$, $|I_L| = t - k_L$. It is easy to see by the construction 2.9 that

$$\text{in}(\partial_L(z)) = m_{\{1, \dots, p' - k_L\} \cup \{j_1, \dots, j_{k_L}\}} e_{\{1, \dots, p' - k_L\} - I_L}.$$

It is enough to show that the initial terms of the cycles are K -linearly independent.

If cycles have different initial monomials in the e_i , there is nothing to show. Take L, L' and assume that the corresponding cycles have the same initial monomial in the e_i . We have to consider two cases. If $k_L = k_{L'}$, then $I_L = I_{L'}$ and the cycles are the same. For $k_L < k_{L'}$ the construction implies

$$\text{in}(m_{\{1, \dots, p' - k_L\} \cup \{j_1, \dots, j_{k_L}\}}) < \text{in}(m_{\{1, \dots, p' - k_{L'}\} \cup \{j_1, \dots, j_{k_{L'}}\}}),$$

which proves the K -linearly independence. $\square$

The next corollary summarizes our results related to the conjecture of Herzog.

Corollary 2.12. *Let M be a finitely generated graded S -module and $p \in \{0, \dots, n\}$. Suppose that $\beta_p^{lin}(M) \neq 0$ and M is the k -th syzygy module in a minimal graded free resolution. Then:*

- (i) *If $k = 0$, then $\beta_i^{lin}(M) \geq \binom{p}{i}$ for $i = 0, \dots, p$.*
- (ii) *If $k = 1$, then $\beta_i^{lin}(M) \geq \binom{p+1}{i+1}$ for $i = 0, \dots, p$.*
- (iii) *If $k > 1$ and $p > 0$, then $\beta_{p-1}^{lin}(M) \geq p + k$.*

Proof. Statement (i) was shown in 2.7. In the proof of 2.11 we proved in fact (ii). Finally, (iii) follows from 2.6 since $\beta_i^{lin}(M) = \beta_{i+k}^{k,lin}(N)$ if M is the k -th syzygy module in the minimal graded free resolution of some module N . $\square$

Recall that a finitely generated graded S -module M satisfies *Serre's condition* $\mathcal{S}_k$ if

$$\text{depth}(M_P) \geq \min(k, \dim S_P)$$

for all $P \in \text{Spec}(S)$. We recall the Auslander-Bridger theorem [2]:

Lemma 2.13. *Let M be a finitely generated graded S -module. Then M is a k -th syzygy module in a graded free resolution if and only if M satisfies $\mathcal{S}_k$.*

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as in [11] where the local case is treated. $\square$

Corollary 2.14. *Let M be a finitely generated graded S -module and $p \in \{0, \dots, n\}$. Suppose that M satisfies $\mathcal{S}_k$ and $\beta_p^{lin}(M) \neq 0$. Then:*

- (i) *If $k = 0$, then $\beta_i^{lin}(M) \geq \binom{p}{i}$ for $i = 0, \dots, p$.*
- (ii) *If $k = 1$, then $\beta_i^{lin}(M) \geq \binom{p+1}{i+1}$ for $i = 0, \dots, p$.*
- (iii) *If $k > 1$ and $p > 0$, then $\beta_{p-1}^{lin}(M) \geq p + k$.*

Proof. According to 2.13 the module M satisfies $\mathcal{S}_k$ if and only if M is a k -th syzygy module in a graded free resolution $G_\bullet \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ of some graded S -module N . It is well-known (see for example [3]) that $G_\bullet = F_\bullet \oplus H_\bullet$ as graded complexes where $F_\bullet$ is the minimal graded free resolution of N and $H_\bullet$ is split exact. Then M splits as a graded module into $\Omega_k(N) \oplus W$ where W is a graded free S -module. If $p = 0$, there is nothing to show. For $p > 0$ it follows that $\beta_p^{lin}(\Omega_k(N)) \neq 0$. Then 2.12 applied to $\Omega_k(N)$ proves the corollary, since $\beta_{i,j}(M) \geq \beta_{i,j}(\Omega_k(N))$ for all integers i, j . $\square$

3. PROOF OF THE CONJECTURE IN THE CASE OF $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -GRADED MODULES

S is $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded with $\deg(x_i) = \varepsilon_i = (0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0)$ where the 1 is at the i -th position. Let $M = \bigoplus_{a \in \mathbb{Z}^n} M_a$ be a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded S -module. Recall that every $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded S -module M is naturally $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded by setting $M_i = \bigoplus_{a \in \mathbb{Z}^n, |a|=i} M_a$. Therefore all methods from the last section can be applied in the following. Furthermore, the Koszul complex and homology are $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded if we assign the degree ε_i to e_i . For example, if $m \in M_a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, then $\deg(me_I)$ is $a + \sum_{i \in I} \varepsilon_i$; or if $z \in K_i(j)$ is homogeneous of degree a , then $\deg(\partial_I(z)) = a - \sum_{i \in I} \varepsilon_i$.

We want to prove more precise results than in the last section for this more restricted situation. Note that 2.2 and 2.3 hold in the $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded setting. The

proofs are verbatim the same if we replace “graded” by “ $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded”. We prove now a modified version of 2.5. Usually we assume that $M = \bigoplus_{a \in \mathbb{N}^n} M_a$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $p \in [j]$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $H_i(j)_{i+t} = 0$ for $i = p-1, \dots, j$, $l = -1, \dots, t-1$ and let $z \in K_p(j)_{p+t}$ be a $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -homogeneous cycle with $0 \neq [z] \in H_p(j)_{p+j}$. Then there exists a $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -homogeneous cycle $\tilde{z}$ with:*

- (i) $[\tilde{z}] = [z] \in H_p(j)_{p+t}$,
- (ii) $[\partial_{j_i}(\tilde{z})] \in H_{p-1}(j)_{p-1+t}$ are K -linearly independent for $i = 1, \dots, p$ and some $j_i \in [j]$.

Proof. We prove by induction on $j \in [n]$ that we find $[\tilde{z}] = [z]$ and a set $\{j_1, \dots, j_p\}$ such that the cycles $[\partial_{j_i}(\tilde{z})]$ are K -linearly independent for $i = 1, \dots, p$.

The cases $j = 1$ and $j > 1, p = j$ follow from 2.2 (ii) because if $\deg(z) = a \in \mathbb{N}^n$, then all $\partial_k(z)$ have different degrees $a - \varepsilon_k$ and it suffices to show that these elements are not boundaries.

Let $j > 1$ and assume that $p < j$. Again it suffices to show that the cycles $\partial_{j_i}(z)$ are not boundaries for a suitable subset $\{j_1, \dots, j_p\} \subseteq [j]$. If such a set exists, then nothing is to prove. Otherwise there exists a $k \in [j]$ with $[\partial_k(z)] = 0$ and we may assume $k = j$. By 2.2 we find $\tilde{z}$ such that $[\tilde{z}] = [z]$ in $H(j)$ and $\tilde{z} \in K(j-1)$. By 1.3 we can apply our induction hypothesis and assume that $\tilde{z}$ has the desired properties in $H(j-1)$. Again by 1.3 we have $H_{p-1}(j-1)_{p-1+t} \subseteq H_{p-1}(j)_{p-1+t}$ and $\tilde{z}$ is the desired element. $\square$

We need the following simple combinatorial result. Let $p \in [n]$. Define inductively a sequence of subsets $W_i \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ for $i = 0, \dots, p$. Set

$$W_0 = \{\emptyset\}.$$

If W_{i-1} is defined, then for every set $w \in W_{i-1}$ we choose $p-i+1$ different elements $i_1^w, \dots, i_{p-i+1}^w$ such that $i_j^w \notin w$. Define

$$W_i = \{w \cup \{i_j^w\} : w \in W_{i-1} \text{ and } j = 1, \dots, p-i+1\}.$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let W_i be defined as above. Then for $i = 0, \dots, p$ we have that*

$$|W_i| \geq \binom{p}{i}.$$

Proof. We prove this by induction on $p \in [n]$. The case $p = 0$ is trivial, so let $p > 0$ and without loss of generality we may assume that $W_1 = \{\{1\}, \dots, \{p\}\}$. The set W_i is the disjoint union of the sets $W_i^1 = \{w \in W_i : 1 \in w\}$ and $W_i^{\hat{1}} = \{w \in W_i : 1 \notin w\}$. The induction hypothesis applied to W_i^1 and $W_i^{\hat{1}}$ implies

$$|W_i| = |W_i^1| + |W_i^{\hat{1}}| \geq \binom{p-1}{i-1} + \binom{p-1}{i} = \binom{p}{i}.$$

$\square$

We prove the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $k \in [n]$ and M be a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded S -module. If $\beta_p^{k,lin}(M) \neq 0$ for some $p \geq k$, then*

$$\beta_i^{k,lin}(M) \geq \binom{p}{i}$$

for $i = k, \dots, p$.

Proof. Without loss of generality $M = \bigoplus_{a \in \mathbb{N}^n} M_a$. Since $\beta_p^{k,lin}(M) \neq 0$, there exists a $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -homogeneous cycle $z \in K_p(n)_{p+d_k(M)}$ such that $0 \neq [z]$ in $H_p(n)_{p+d_k(M)}$ and $\deg(z) = a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{N}^n$. By the definition of $d_k(M)$ and 1.3 we have $H_i(n)_{i+l} = 0$ for $i \geq k$ and $l = -1, \dots, d_k(M) - 1$.

We construct inductively W_i as above, as well as cycles z_w for each $w \in W_i$ such that $[z_w] \neq 0$, $\deg(z_w) = a - \sum_{i \in w} \varepsilon_i$, $0 \neq [\partial_{i_k^w}(z_w)]$ for $k = 1, \dots, p-i$ and suitable $i_k^w \notin w$. Furthermore, z_w is an element of the Koszul complex with respect to the variables x_i with $i \notin w$. For $i \geq k$ we take all cycles $z_w \in K_i(n)_{i+d_k(M)}$ with $w \in W_i$ which have different $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -degree. They are not zero and therefore K -linearly independent in homology. By 3.2 there are at least $\binom{p}{p-i} = \binom{p}{i}$ of them and this concludes the proof.

Let $W_0 = \{\emptyset\}$. By 3.1 we can choose z in a way such that $[z_{i_j}] = [\partial_{i_j}(z)] \neq 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, p$ and some $i_j \in [n]$. Choose $z_\emptyset = z$ and $i_j^\emptyset = i_j$.

If W_{i-1} and z_w for $w \in W_{i-1}$ are constructed, then define W_i with W_{i-1} and the given i_k^w for $w \in W_{i-1}$. For $w' \in W_i$ with $w' = w \cup \{i_k^w\}$, re-choose $z_{w'} = \partial_{i_k^w}(z_w)$ by 3.1 in such a way that $[\partial_{i_j^{w'}}(z_{w'})] \neq 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, p-i$ and some $i_j^{w'} \in [n]$.

Note that since z_w has no monomial which is divided by some e_i for $i \in w$, we can use 2.2 and 2.3 to avoid these e_i in the construction of $z_{w'}$ again. By 1.3 the cycles $\partial_{i_j^{w'}}(z_{w'})$ are also not zero in $H(n)$. Clearly $i_j^{w'} \notin w'$ and the assertion follows. $\square$

In the $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded setting we prove the desired results about β_i^{lin} in full generality.

Corollary 3.4. *Let M be a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded S -module and M is the k -th syzygy module in a minimal $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded free resolution. If $\beta_p^{lin}(M) \neq 0$ for some $p \in \mathbb{N}$, then*

$$\beta_i^{lin}(M) \geq \binom{p+k}{i+k}$$

for $i = 0, \dots, p$.

Proof. This follows from 3.3 and the fact that

$$\beta_i^{lin}(M) = \beta_{i+k}^{k,lin}(N) \geq \binom{p+k}{i+k}$$

where M is the k -th syzygy module of a $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded S -module N . $\square$

Analogue to 2.13 we get:

Lemma 3.5. *Let M be a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded S -module. Then M satisfies $\mathcal{S}_k$ if and only if M is a k -th syzygy module in a $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded free resolution.*

Corollary 3.6. *Let M be a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded S -module and M satisfies S_k . If $\beta_p^{lin}(M) \neq 0$ for some $p \in \mathbb{N}$, then*

$$\beta_i^{lin}(M) \geq \binom{p+k}{i+k}$$

for $i = 0, \dots, p$.

Proof. The assertion follows from 3.4 with similar arguments as in the graded case. $\square$

4. BOUNDS FOR BETTI NUMBERS OF IDEALS WITH A FIXED NUMBER OF GENERATORS IN GIVEN DEGREE AND A LINEAR RESOLUTION

In this section we are interested in bounds for the graded Betti numbers of graded ideals of S . We assume that the field K is infinite and fix a basis $\mathbf{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$ of S_1 . For a monomial x^a of S with $|a| = d$ we denote by $R(x^a) = \{x^b : |b| = d, x^b \geq_{rlex} x^a\}$ the revlex-segment of x^a where $\geq_{rlex}$ is defined as follows: $x^a \geq_{rlex} x^b$ if either $|a| > |b|$ or $|a| = |b|$ and there exists an integer r such that $a_r < b_r$ and $a_s = b_s$ for $s > r$. Note that for a given $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq k \leq \binom{n+d-1}{d}$ there exists a unique ideal $I(d, k)$ which is generated in degree d by a revlex-segment $R(x^a)$ for some monomial x^a with $|R(x^a)| = k$.

Following Eliahou and Kervaire [10] for a given monomial x^a let $m(x^a)$ be the maximal i with x_i divides x^a . An ideal is a monomial ideal if it is generated by monomials. We call a monomial ideal I stable if for all monomials $x^a \in I$ we have $x_i x^a / x_{m(x^a)} \in I$ for $i < m(x^a)$. Is it easy to see that it is enough to prove this condition for the generators of the ideal I . For example $I(d, k)$ is stable.

For stable ideals there exist explicit formulas for the Betti numbers (see [10]). Let $I \subset S$ be a stable ideal and $G(I)$ be the set of minimal generators of I . Then

$$\beta_{i,i+j}(I) = \sum_{x^a \in G(I), |a|=j} \binom{m(x^a) - 1}{i} \quad (*).$$

If a stable ideal I is generated in one degree d , then I has a linear resolution.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $I \subset S$ be a stable ideal generated in degree $d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\beta_{0,d}(I) = k$. Then*

$$\beta_{i,i+j}(I) \geq \beta_{i,i+j}(I(d, k))$$

for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Fix $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq k \leq \binom{n+d-1}{d}$. Let $l(I)$ be the number of monomials in I_d which are not monomials in $I(d, k)_d$. We prove the statement by induction on $l(I)$. If $l(I) = 0$, then $I = I(d, k)$ and there is nothing to show.

Assume that $l(I) > 0$. Let x^a be the smallest monomial in I_d with respect to $\geq_{rlex}$ which is not in $I(d, k)_d$, and x^b be the largest monomial which is in $I(d, k)_d$, but not in I_d . Define the ideal $\tilde{I}$ by $G(\tilde{I}) = (G(I) \setminus \{x^a\}) \cup \{x^b\}$. Then $l(\tilde{I}) = l(I) - 1$, and $\tilde{I}$ is also stable. Thus, by the induction hypothesis

$$\beta_{i,i+j}(\tilde{I}) \geq \beta_{i,i+j}(I(d, k)).$$

Since $x^b >_{\text{revlex}} x^a$, the revlex order implies $m(x^b) \leq m(x^a)$. Therefore $(*)$ yields

$$\beta_{i,i+j}(I) \geq \beta_{i,i+j}(\tilde{I}),$$

which proves the assertion. $\square$

For a graded ideal I , the initial ideal $\text{in}(I)$ is generated by all $\text{in}(f)$ for $f \in I$ with respect to some monomial order.

Every element g of the general linear group $\text{GL}(n)$ induces a linear automorphism of S by

$$g(x_j) = \sum_{i=1}^n g_{i,j} x_i \text{ for } g = (g_{i,j}).$$

There is a non-empty open set $U \subset \text{GL}(n)$ and a unique monomial ideal J with $J = \text{in}(g(I))$ for every $g \in U$ with respect to the revlex order (for details see [7]). We call J the generic initial ideal of I and denote it by $\text{Gin}(I)$. A nice property is that $\text{Gin}(I)$ is Borel-fixed, i.e. $\text{Gin}(I) = b \text{Gin}(I)$ for all $b \in B$ where B is the Borel subgroup of $\text{GL}(n)$ which is generated by all upper triangular matrices.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $I \subset S$ be a graded ideal with d -linear resolution. Then $\text{Gin}(I)$ is stable, independent of the characteristic of K , and $\beta_{i,i+j}(I) = \beta_{i,i+j}(\text{Gin}(I))$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. It is well-known that $\text{reg}(\text{Gin}(I)) = \text{reg}(I)$. Therefore $\text{reg}(\text{Gin}(I)) = d$ and $\text{Gin}(I)$ also has a d -linear resolution. [9, Prop. 10] implies that a Borel-fixed monomial ideal, which is generated in degree d , has regularity d if and only if it is stable. Thus we get that $\text{Gin}(I)$ is a stable ideal, independent of the characteristic of K .

Since I has a linear resolution, we obtain by the main result in [1] that $\beta_{i,i+j}(I) = \beta_{i,i+j}(\text{Gin}(I))$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. $\square$

Theorem 4.3. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq k \leq \binom{n+d-1}{d}$ and $I \subset S$ be a graded ideal with d -linear resolution and k generators. Then*

$$\beta_{i,i+j}(I) \geq \beta_{i,i+j}(I(d, k))$$

for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. This follows from 4.1 and 4.2. $\square$

Consider the lexicographic order $>_{\text{lex}}$. Recall that for monomials $x^a, x^b \in S$ we have $x^a >_{\text{lex}} x^b$ if either $|a| > |b|$ or $|a| = |b|$ and there exists an integer r such that $a_r > b_r$ and $a_s = b_s$ for $s < r$. Then $L(x^a) = \{x^b : |b| = d, x^b \geq_{\text{lex}} x^a\}$ is the lex-segment of x^a . For a given $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq k \leq \binom{n+d-1}{d}$ there exists a unique ideal $J(d, k)$ which is generated in degree d by a lex-segment $L(x^a)$ for some monomial x^a with $|L(x^a)| = k$. It is easy to see that $J(d, k)$ is a lex-ideal, i.e. if $x^b >_{\text{lex}} x^c$ and $x^c \in J(d, k)$, then $x^b \in J(d, k)$. In particular $J(d, k)$ is stable.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq k \leq \binom{n+d-1}{d}$ and $I \subset S$ be a graded ideal with d -linear resolution and k generators. Then*

$$\beta_{i,i+j}(I) \leq \beta_{i,i+j}(J(d, k))$$

for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. By [15, Thm. 31] we find a lex-ideal L with the same Hilbert function as I and $\beta_{i,i+j}(I) \leq \beta_{i,i+j}(L)$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. We see that $\beta_{0,d}(L) = \beta_{0,d}(I) = k$ because these ideals share the same Hilbert function. It follows that $J(d, k) = (L_d)$, and in particular $G(J(d, k)) = G(L)_d$. Therefore

$$\beta_{i,i+d}(I) \leq \beta_{i,i+d}(L) = \beta_{i,i+d}(J(d, k))$$

for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ where the last equality follows from (*). $\square$

Fix $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq k \leq \binom{n+d-1}{d}$. Let $\mathcal{B}(d, k)$ be the set of Betti sequences $\{\beta_{i,j}(I)\}$ where I is a graded ideal with d -linear resolution and $\beta_{0,d}(I) = k$. On $\mathcal{B}(d, k)$ we consider a partial order: We set $\{\beta_{i,j}(I)\} \geq \{\beta_{i,j}(J)\}$ if $\beta_{i,j}(I) \geq \beta_{i,j}(J)$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq k \leq \binom{n+d-1}{d}$. Then $\{\beta_{i,j}(I(d, k))\}$ is the unique minimal element and $\{\beta_{i,j}(J(d, k))\}$ is the unique maximal element of $\mathcal{B}(d, k)$.*

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Aramova, J. Herzog and T. Hibi, Ideals with stable Betti numbers, *Adv. Math.* **152** (2000), no. 1, 72-77.
- [2] M. Auslander and M. Bridger, Stable Module Theory, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* (1969), no. 94.
- [3] L. L. Avramov, Infinite free resolutions, Six lectures on commutative algebra (Bellaterra, 1996), 1-118, *Progr. Math.* **166**, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1998.
- [4] A. Bigatti, Upper bounds for the Betti numbers of a given Hilbert function, *Comm. Algebra* **21** (1993), no. 7, 2317-2334.
- [5] W. Bruns and J. Herzog, Cohen-Macaulay rings, revised edition, *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics* **39**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- [6] H. Charalambous and E. Evans, Resolutions with a given Hilbert function, *Contemp. Math.* **159** (1994), 19-26.
- [7] D. Eisenbud, Commutative algebra with a view toward algebraic geometry, *Graduate Texts in Mathematics* **150**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [8] D. Eisenbud and J. Koh, Some linear syzygy conjectures, *Adv. Math.* **90** (1991), no. 1, 47-76.
- [9] D. Eisenbud, A. Reeves and B. Totaro, Initial ideals, Veronese subrings, and rates of algebras, *Adv. Math.* **109** (1994), no. 2, 168-187.
- [10] S. Eliahou and M. Kervaire, Minimal resolutions of some monomial ideals, *J. Algebra* **129** (1990), no. 1, 1-25.
- [11] E. G. Evans and P. Griffith, Syzygies, London Mathematical Society, *Lecture Note Series* **106**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge-New York, 1985.
- [12] M. Green, Koszul cohomology and the geometry of projective varieties, *J. Diff. Geom.* **19** (1984), no. 1, 125-171.
- [13] J. Herzog, The linear strand of a graded free resolution, unpublished notes (1998).
- [14] H. Hulett, Maximum Betti numbers of homogeneous ideals with a given Hilbert function, *Comm. Algebra* **21** (1993), no. 7, 2335-2350.
- [15] K. Pardue, Deformation classes of graded modules and maximal Betti numbers, *Illinois J. Math.* **40** (1996), no. 4, 564-585.
- [16] V. Reiner and V. Welker, Linear syzygies of Stanley-Reisner ideals, *Math. Scand.*, to appear.

Tim Römer
FB6 Mathematik und Informatik
Universität Essen
45117 Essen
Germany
tim.roemer@uni-essen.de